DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 167 951 CS 004 639

AUTHOR Myers, Betty; And Others
TITLE Perceived Problems of Teachers of Reading: Fact and Paradox.
PUB DATE [75]
NOTE 66p.; Study prepared at Ohio State University

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; *Needs Assessment; *Reading Instruction; Reading Processes; *Reading Research; Research Methodology; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Morale; Teaching Conditions

ABSTRACT

Responses from 528 reading teachers to two scales, one indicating the extent to which they perceived a problem as occurring frequently in their classrooms and the other indicating the extent to which they perceived a problem as bothersome, were factor analyzed. Eleven "frequency" and ten "bothersome" factors emerged from the analysis. Among the problems seen by educators to be either difficult to resolve or occurring with noticeable frequency were invigorating student interest in reading, achieving a sense of professional worth, and building skills in reading comprehension. The factors emerging from the analysis also revealed interesting assumptions and convictions about teaching, the reading process, learning, and curriculum. Several factors revealed a deep sense of frustration and a desire to improve and grow professionally, while others reflected an unusually narrow conception of curriculum. (Six tables of data are included.) (Author/FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED167951

PERCEIVED PROBLEMS OF TEACHERS OF READING: FACT AND PARADOX

Betty Myers
Donald R. Cruickshank
Victor M. Rentel

There is today a great uneasiness about reading shared by both professional educators and the public at large. This uneasiness arises out of a realization that many children but especially poor children from urban schools are completing their education with woeful shortcomings in reading. These shortcomings are regarded by observers of American education as having potentially explosive social and economic consequences. Yet, surprisingly, no aspect of American education has been studied as intensively and extensively as reading. The great bulk of this research has compared the effectiveness of one teaching method over another. More recently there has been a resurgence of theoretical research on the reading process. Neither theoretical nor methods research has shed much light on the causes of these reading shortcomings or on the problems teachers encounter in teaching reading.

The aim of the present study was to explore a variety of perceived problems educators encountered in the daily give-and-take of teaching children to read. Since such educators play crucial roles in whatever successes or failures characterize the teaching of reading, what they think, feel and do about teaching reading is important and must be known if we are to uncover the shortcomings associated with reading failure. The purposes of this report, therefore, are: (1) to identify the problems of reading educators as a prelude to solutions which may then be hypothesized; and (2) to describe a needs-assessment methodology by which this goal can be accomplished.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Betty Myers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CS806639

The basic assumption is that if we can discover what students' and teachers' problems are, we have gained enormously valuable insight into their world and we are in a position to help them at some level to reduce or eliminate these problems.

The methodology for identifying problems is straightforward. Initially, first-person accounts of classroom problems are elicited from students and/or teachers. Second, since problems are considered instances of goal-response interference, one or more goal statements are inferred from each personal account. Third, goal statements are inspected in order to eliminate duplication. Fourth, goal statements are made into a self-administering checklist usually with two scales--one which indicates how frequently the goal is not attained and another which indicates how bothersome it is when the goal is not attained. Fifth, the checklist is responded to by the desired sample of either students or teachers. Sixth, the responses are analyzed to determine which individual problems are significantly frequent and/or bothersome and which groups of similar problems (problem areas) seem most noteworthy. Finally specific feedback is prepared for the respondents. Upon getting the feedback, individualized and personalized programs of inservice education for teachers can be developed.

The methodology has been used on a number of occasions to determine teacher and/or student concerns (4, 6, 7). [A review of these and other related studies is available (5).] Most recently it was employed as a part of The Ohio Right to Read Program.

The purpose of using the needs assessment methodology therein was two-fold. Generally there was an interest in determining the problems of teachers of reading so that statewide attention might be focused upon them. More specifically

it was hoped that by exposing Right to Read participants to the methodology and showing them how to use it, they in turn would identify concerns of teachers of reading in their school districts and institute more meaningful, and personal programs of inservice education.

PROCEDURES

The present study sought to expose Right to Read participants at a statewide conference to the needs assessment methodology so that they could use it to identify problems of teachers of reading in their school districts and institute more meaningful inservice programs. The procedure for accomplishing the objectives was identical to that reported in earlier studies--that is, prior to and during the July 1975 Conference, participants were engaged in identification of their perceived problems and consideration of the methodology by which they were determined.

Because some participants in earlier conferences found it time-consuming to conduct a study involving both stage one (the collection of teacher problems) and stage two (their verification), the validity and reliability of the checklist were improved so that it could be used directly by school districts and thus eliminate any need to do stage one. In order to do this the instrument was subjected to further item analysis with a larger population of teachers of reading. Consequently, the present study determines and reports what teachers of reading in Ohio perceive their problems to be.

Two samples of teachers were involved in the present study. The stage one sample from whom problems were collected consisted of 40 teachers enrolled in graduate courses at Ohio State University during the spring of 1975. Right

to Read Conference participants could not participate in this stage since these participants were not, as yet, identified.

The instrument used in stage one for collecting the personal accounts of teacher problems, the MBRPTI, was based on a similar instrument, the My Biggest Problem Today Inventory (MBPTI) form used and described in two previous studies (4, 7). Thereon, teachers of reading are requested to record personal accounts of the biggest problem they encounter each day when teaching reading. An example of a problem reported by a teacher follows:

> Great disparity in reading ability and interests left the class moaning over what, to me, was a brief and interesting assignment. My feelings of frustration seemed to keep me from stimulating any interest, absolutely no response to my most "provocative" questions: The class ended with the students and me disgruntled.

A second kind of information solicited by the MBRPTI was the respondent's reaction to the incident on each of three sets of polar adjectives: frequent-infrequent; bothersome-not bothersome and solvable-insolvable.

Thirdly, the respondent was asked to classify the personal account reported on each MBRPTI according to one of fourteen different needs. These needs, among them Achievement, Competence, Counteraction and Efficiency, had been identified in the two previous studies of problems of teachers of reading. Following the first three steps of the methodology, the MBRPTI was administered to the stage one sample of forty teachers and duplications and redundancies were eliminated. There were 38 somewhat different goal-statements added to the checklist. These new goal statements when combined with the 68 items on the original Teacher Problems Checklist (Reading) constituted a revised 106-item instrument, the Teachers Problems Checklist: Reading (TPC-R).

In addition to increasing the number of items on the checklist, the response mode was changed as well. On the first checklist, respondents had been asked to indicate on two, two-point scales (yes-no) the extent to which each problem was frequently occurring and bothersome. On the TPC-R each of the frequency and bothersomeness scales became a five-point scale. There were two reasons for selecting this scale. First, it was assumed that frequency and bothersomeness were variables which exist on a continuum. Feedback from teachers indicating that they had difficulty responding to the items on dichotomous scales supported this assumption. Secondly, the purpose was then to construct a scale on which teachers could respond in a psychometrically reliable way and which would allow the responses to be distributed so that they would yield the greatest variance possible. A modified five-point Likert scale was employed to accomplish these purposes. Below is an example of two specific problems from the TPC-R and the scales on which teachers responded.

RELATED TO READING I HAVE A PROBLEM . . .

FREQUENCY						BOTHERSOME				
Always		Occasionally		Never		Extremely		Somewhat		Not at all
☐ 5	☐ 4	☐ 3	☐ 2	☐ 1	1 Having appropriate materials for different reading levels.	☐ 5	☐ 4	☐ 3	☐ 2	☐ 1
☐ 5	☐ 4	☐ 3	☐ 2	☐ 1	2 Helping students comprehend non-fiction	☐ 5	☐ 4	☐ 3	☐ 2	☐ 1

The stage two sample were the members of the July 1975 Right to Read Conference. Each was sent a letter which explained the purpose of the study and requested the participant's cooperation in two ways. First, he or she was asked to complete one of three checklists which accompanied the letter. Second, the participant was asked to get two colleagues to respond to the other two checklists in order to provide a large enough response so that the 106-item checklist could be factor analyzed.

Table 1 indicates the number of returned and usable checklists by subgroups of respondents.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO RETURNED USABLE CHECKLISTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	Number of Checklists Returned
Elementary Teachers	222
Middle School Teachers	69
High School Teachers	57
Reading Specialists	87
Supervisory or Administrative Personnel	79
"Others"	10
General Unspecified Classroom Teachers	4
TOTAL	528

RESULTS

Participants responded to both the frequency and bothersomeness of the problems and their responses were analyzed separately in order to report two kinds of information. First, specific problems for all the Conference participants and for subgroups of participants were determined. Second, problem areas which were identified by all the respondents were reported.

In order to identify the specific problems perceived to be the most frequent, the mean frequency of all the problems was determined first. Then each mean which was higher than the average was tested to determine if it significantly ($p < .01$) exceeded the value of the average frequency of the problems.

Since an intention of the needs assessment methodology also is to be able to provide results for meaningful subgroups of respondents, Table 2 presents the average responses and ranks of the 52 most frequently occurring problems for five subgroups of respondents: elementary teachers, middle school teachers, high school teachers, reading specialists and supervisory and administrative personnel.

TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF THE SIGNIFICANTLY FREQUENT PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED BY ALL THE RESPONDENTS FOR FIVE SUBGROUPS

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
1	Having appropriate materials for different reading levels.	2.87/33.5	3.16/39.5	3.39/22.5	2.57/58.5	2.97/23.5
3	Changing the negative perceptions and attitudes of students toward reading--doing those things which seem likely to result in more positive perceptions and attitudes.	2.85/38.5	3.39/20.5	3.39/22.5	3.17/12	3.11/11
8	Getting students to work more thoroughly and slowly.	3.55/3	3.87/2	3.47/15.5	3.26/6	3.13/9
15	Because I want my students to have a better self-concept.	2.88/32	3.32/25	3.40/20	3.17/12	2.90/34.5
16	Getting students to read at a rate appropriate for comprehending the material.	3.00/17	3.22/32	3.14/41	2.97/23.5	2.92/29.5
17	Getting students to learn and remember basic terms in a special subject area.	2.87/33.5	3.20/34.5	3.39/22.5	2.57/58.5	2.99/22

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
18	Stimulating students to do remedial work in reading.	2.90/28.5	3.25/30	3.14/41	2.77/44	2.95/25.5
19	Getting students to enjoy it.	2.69/54	3.29/28	3.53/13.5	2.85/35	2.97/23.5
20	Demonstrating that my students have learned what I thought I had taught.	2.66/62	2.97/62	3.07/46	2.60/54.5	2.77/54.5
21	Knowing about and having available a full range of reading materials--doing those things which identify and procure such materials.	2.86/36	3.19/37.5	3.53/13.5	2.53/63	2.87/37
22	Finding material of interest for each student.	3.00/17	3.46/14	3.37/25	2.93/27	3.06/13
24	Identifying students' reading difficulties.	2.82/41	3.04/55	3.21/32	2.41/70.5	3.05/16
28	Getting students to comprehend.	3.26/6	3.41/19	3.58/10	3.20/95	3.23/5
29	Having students make inferences from their reading.	3.21/19	3.65/7.5	3.63/7	3.56/1.5	3.13/9
30	Having enough time to work with students who need special help.	3.99/1	4.30/1	3.95/7	3.43/4	3.67/1
32	Getting students to follow directions.	3.17/11	3.49/12	3.44/17	3.14/15	2.90/34.5
35	Doing the things which seem likely to help students improve in reading comprehension ability such as giving	2.72/49.5	3.01/57.5	3.16/37	2.87/31	2.77/54.5

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
	attention to meaning, retention, inference making, vocabulary development and syntax.					
36	Having students feel successful at reading.	2.59/65	3.14/43	3.16/37	2.72/49.5	2.80/50.5
37	Providing for individual differences.	3.00/17	3.36/22.5	3.58/10	2.66/51.5	3.03/19.5
38	Getting students to do things such as working carefully or spelling correctly.	3.44/4	3.86/3	3.82/3	3.20/95	3.15/7
40	Getting students to see meaning in the printed page.	2.85/38.5	3.14/43	3.14/41	3.00/21.5	2.85/40
45	Getting students to improve in language arts abilities, especially reading. Doing those things which seem likely to improve those abilities.	2.70/52.5	3.20/34.5	3.12/44	2.87/31	2.82/46.5
46	Getting students to read accurately orally.	2.82/41	2.99/60	2.79/66.5	2.82/37	2.56/67.5
47	Improving my student's vocabularies.	2.90/28.5	3.46/14	3.67/5	3.21/8	3.05/16
49	Knowing each student and his or her reading problems.	2.62/59	3.14/43	3.47/15.5	3.53/63	3.06/13
52	Gaining skill in the diagnosis of individual student reading difficulties and having the time and opportunity to employ such skills.	3.39/5	3.77/4	3.35/26.5	2.95/25.5	3.25/3

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
54	Helping students learn to read fluently.	2.90/28.5	3.30/26.5	3.05/45	3.05/16.5	2.75/56.5
56	Having appropriate materials for different interest levels.	2.93/24	3.36/22.5	3.18/34.5	2.79/41.5	2.95/25.5
57	Having preparation time.	3.23/7.5	3.45/16	3.04/49.5	2.82/37	2.80/50.5
61	Getting students to read aloud with expression.	3.02/13	3.26/29	3.09/45	3.03/18	2.59/62
64	Improving students' word attack skills.	2.86/36	3.20/34.5	2.56/77.5	2.87/31	2.81/48.5
65	Getting students to read so that they develop better understanding of language structure such as complete sentences and sentence fragments.	3.00/17	3.30/26.5	3.14/41	3.01/20	2.91/32
66	Teaching too many students or large classes.	2.95/21.5	3.43/17	2.96/56	2.28/79	2.43/79
67	Helping studentsto comprehend what they are reading orally.	2.95/21.5	3.23/31	2.98/52	2.81/39	2.84/43
69	Because I want students to have confidence enough to attack new words.	2.82/41	3.09/51	2.98/52	3.02/19	2.84/43
72	Because I want other students to be more considerate of students who do not read as well.	2.73/48	3.19/37.5	3.04/49.5	2.86/33.5	2.82/46.5
73	Enhancing my students' interest in and attitude toward reading.	2.68/55.5	3.35/24	3.42/185	3.17/12	3.04/18

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
79	Knowing how to help students with low I.Q., poor vision, or hearing problems.	2.86/3.6	3.10/48.5	3.02/51	2.74/48	2.91/32
80	Finding enough time to help all reading groups.	3.55/2	3.75/5	3.05/47.5	2.75/46.5	3.24/4
81	Completing the work I have planned.	3.00/17	2.99/60	2.79/66.5	2.77/44	2.91/32
85	Because I want parents to be more concerned about their child's reading ability.	3.23/7.5	3.59/10	3.26/30	3.38/5	3.06/73
87	Getting students to read more.	3.18/10	3.71/6	3.86/2	3.56/1.5	3.30/2
88	Getting students to read at their own grade level.	2.60/62	3.09/51	3.18/34.5	2.97/23.5	2.61/61
89	Helping students to overcome perceptual problems.	2.89/31	2.99/60	2.79/71	3.00/21.5	3.05/16
90	Motivating students to read.	2.80/44	3.52/11	3.58/10	3.24/7	3.13/9
92	Knowing about and having appropriate materials for a wide range of students.	2.97/20	3.42/18	3.35/26.5	2.66/51.5	2.94/27.5
93	Getting students to try harder.	3.01/14	3.65/7.5	3.61/8	3.05/16.5	2.89/36
94	Overcoming students' feelings of frustration.	2.71/51	3.01/57.5	3.26/30	2.90/28	2.84/43

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
98	Getting students to read for and recall details.	2.91/26	3.20/34.5	3.39/22.5	2.89/29	2.75/56.5
100	Getting students to retain and use what they have learned.	3.16/12	3.64/9	3.72/4	3.44/3	2.75/56.5
101	Because I want students to be prepared.	2.90/28.5	3.46/14	3.56/12	2.79/41.5	2.84/43
102	Overcoming students' indifference toward reading.	2.97/46	3.39/20.5	3.42/18.5	3.15/14	3.01/21

Note that a problem may be frequently occurring for the whole group while it may occur only infrequently for a subgroup, and vice versa.

Table 3 presents the same kind of results for the 48 most bothersome problems for the five subgroups of respondents.

TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF THE SIGNIFICANTLY BOTHERSOME PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED BY ALL THE RESPONDENTS FOR FIVE SUBGROUPS

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
1	Having appropriate materials for different reading levels.	3.35/26.5	3.59/26	3.77/13	3.22/37.5	3.35/17
3	Changing the negative perceptions and attitudes of students toward reading--doing those things which seem likely to result in more positive perceptions and attitudes.	3.54/14	3.77/15	3.74/15	3.94/1	3.67/2
8	Getting students to work more thoroughly and slowly.	3.94/3	3.97/4	3.67/19	3.80/7	3.43/8.5
15	Because I want my students to have a better self-concept.	3.28/33	3.39/38.5	3.49/32.5	3.62/13	3.10/39
18	Stimulating students to do remedial work in reading.	3.27/35	3.32/44.5	3.26/50	3.22/37.5	3.08/41
19	Getting students to enjoy it.	3.20/41	3.57/28	3.82/10	3.38/27.5	3.28/23.5

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
21	Knowing about and having available a full range of reading materials--doing those things which identify and procure such materials.	3.14/45	3.39/38.5	3.72/17.5	3.00/57	3.06/42.5
22	Finding materials of interest for each student.	3.29/31	3.72/18	3.72/17.5	3.51/19	3.34/18
24	Identifying students' reading difficulties.	3.65/9	3.55/29	3.54/27	3.38/27.5	3.52/4
28	Getting students to comprehend.	3.82/6	3.81/10.5	3.93/6	3.60/15	3.47/7
29	Having students make inferences from their reading.	3.49/18.5	3.84/8	3.61/20.5	3.66/10	3.37/15.5
30	Being awake and alert.	4.41/1	4.52/1	4.02/1	3.91/2	3.87/1
32	Getting students to follow directions.	3.91/4.5	4.13/2	3.82/10	3.60/15	3.29/21
36	Having students feel successful at reading.	3.28/33	3.39/38.5	3.37/42.5	3.48/20.5	3.16/33
37	Providing for individual differences.	3.66/8	3.65/21.5	3.54/27	3.25/35.5	3.28/23.5
38	Getting students to do things such as working carefully or spelling correctly.	3.70/7	4.12/2	3.96/3	3.60/15	3.41/10

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
40	Getting students to see meaning in the printed page.	3.24/38	3.32/44.5	3.35/44	3.45/23	3.09/40
45	Getting students to improve in language arts abilities, especially reading. Doing those things which seem likely to improve those abilities.	3.01/55.5	3.25/49.5	3.30/46	3.15/44	2.97/47
47	Improving my students' vocabularies.	3.01/55.5	3.45/33.5	3.61/20.5	3.53/18	3.13/38
49	Knowing each student and his or her reading problem.	3.28/33	3.45/33.5	3.56/24.5	3.34/29	3.38/14
52	Gaining skill in the diagnosis of individual student reading difficulties and having the time and opportunity to employ such skills.	3.91/14.5	3.94/5	3.37/42.5	3.58/17	3.51/5.5
56	Having appropriate materials for different interest levels.	3.21/40	3.58/27	3.47/34.5	3.13/45	3.15/35.5
57	Having preparation time.	3.60/11	3.52/31	3.26/50	3.08/50	2.91/53.5
62	Maintaining student attention.	3.38/23	3.51/32	3.46/37	3.06/54.5	3.18/30.5
64	Improving students' word attack skills.	3.26/36.5	3.13/61	2.74/76.5	3.20/40	3.00/45.5

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
65	Getting students to read so that they develop better understanding of language structure such as complete sentences and sentence fragments.	3.14/15.5	3.34/41	3.28/47.5	3.12/46.5	3.00/45.5
66	Teaching too many students or large classes.	3.52/15.5	3.83/9	3.18/55	2.71/73	2.70/69
67	Helping students to comprehend what they are reading orally.	3.19/42	3.30/48	3.19/54	3.00/57	2.96/49
69	Because I want students to have confidence enough to attack new words.	3.09/48	3.19/53	3.04/60	3.39/26	3.01/44
72	Because I want other students to be more considerate of students who do not read as well.	3.45/20	3.77/15	3.79/12	3.64/12	3.27/25
73	Enhancing my students' interest in and attitude toward reading.	3.07/51	3.70/20	3.49/32.5	3.75/8	3.29/21
78	Overcoming student apathy or outright dislike.	3.03/53.5	3.62/24	3.58/22.5	3.32/31.5	3.29/21
79	Knowing how to help students with low I.Q., poor vision, or hearing problems.	3.55/13	3.61/25	3.47/34.5	3.44/24.5	3.37/15.5

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
80	Finding enough time to help all reading groups.	3.99/2	3.91/6.5	3.28/47.5	3.28/34	3.39/12
82	Dealing with students who are bright but slow readers.	3.37/24.5	3.13/61	3.05/60	3.20/40	3.16/33
85	Because I want parents to be more concerned about their child's reading ability.	3.64/10	3.74/17	3.54/27	3.65/11	3.18/30.5
87	Getting students to read more.	3.52/15.5	3.80/12.5	3.95/4	3.84/6	3.51/15.5
89	Helping students to overcome perceptual problems.	3.30/30	3.13/61	3.11/57	3.44/24.5	3.30/79
90	Motivating students to read.	3.32/29	3.77/15	3.93/6	3.87/3.5	3.43/8.5
91	Doing an effective job of teaching reading.	3.49/18.5	3.65/21.5	3.58/22.5	3.47/22	3.39/12
92	Knowing about and having appropriate materials for a wide range of students.	3.37/24.5	3.64/23	3.51/30	3.09/48	3.15/35.5
93	Getting students to try harder.	3.50/17	3.80/12.5	3.90/8	3.68/9	3.16/33
94	Overcoming students' feelings of frustration.	3.35/26.5	3.54/30	3.74/15	3.48/20.5	3.24/27.5

TPC-R	Problem Statement	Elementary School Teachers	Middle School Teachers	High School Teachers	Reading Specialists	Supervisory and Administrative Personnel
98	Getting students to read for and recall details.	3.15/43	3.17/56	3.56/24.5	3.08/50	2.76/63
100	Getting students to retain and use what they have learned.	3.57/12	3.91/6.5	3.98/2	3.87/3.5	3.24/27.5
101	Because I want students to be prepared.	3.26/36.5	3.81/10.5	3.82/10	3.20/40	2.96/49
102	Overcoming students' indifference toward reading.	3.40/22	3.71/19	3.93/6	3.85/5	3.39/12
106	Having students feel that they are making satisfactory progress.	3.08/49.5	3.32/44.5	3.46/37	3.32/31.5	3.06/42.5

In order to attempt to identify the problem areas represented by the 106 specific problems on the TPC-R, a factor analysis was done separately for the frequency and bothersomeness responses. The frequency responses and the bothersomeness responses of the 528 respondents to the 106 items on the TPC-R were first subjected to the principal-axis method of common factor analysis to determine the number of salient common factors that could be meaningfully rotated. To be sure to account for all meaningful factors in these two sets of data, each of the 106-item correlation matrices was "overfactored" (i.e., 20 factors) initially using modified squared multiple correlations as first estimates of the effective communalities (8:4-5).

Relative to the initial factoring of the frequency responses, a summary of resultant eigenvalues and estimated variance shared is given in the left-hand portion of Table 4.

TABLE 4

PRINCIPAL AXIS SOLUTION OF FREQUENCY RESPONSES USED TO DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF SALIENT FACTORS

	Squared Multiple Correlations Used as Estimates of Communalities			Sum of Squared Factor Loadings Subsequently Used as Estimates of Communalities	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Eigenvalue Difference	Percent Variance	Eigenvalue	Percent Variance
1	23.60	19.82	48.10	23.56	54.04
2	3.78	.47	55.80	3.75	62.65
3	3.31	.21	62.55	3.26	70.14
4	3.10	.17	68.87	3.07	77.18

TABLE 4
(Continued)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Eigenvalue Difference	Percent Variance	Eigenvalue	Percent Variance
5	1.93	.28	72.80	1.88	81.50
6	1.65	.12	76.17	1.62	85.22
7	1.53	.17	79.29	1.48	88.61
8	1.36	.19	82.06	1.33	91.65
9	1.17	.08	84.44	1.12	94.21
10	1.09	.02	86.67	1.05	96.63
11	1.07	.14	88.84	1.02	98.98
12	.93	.05	90.74		
13	.88	.05	92.53		
14	.83	.05	94.21		
15	.78	.01	95.80		
16	.77	.08	97.37		
17	.69	.03	98.78		
18	.66	.01	100.12		
19	.65	.05	101.44		
20	.60		102.66*		

* When the factor matrix is initially overfactored and squared multiple correlations are used for communality estimation, it is common that latter factors account for more than 100 percent of common variance (trace).

The summary offered by Table 4 was used to judge the number of frequency factors (salient factors) that could be meaningfully rotated. The principal methods used to determine the number of factors to be retained for rotation

were Cattell's scree test (3:206) and an examination of the overfactored initial principal axis matrix (not shown). To apply Cattell's scree test, the eigenvalue difference column is studied for the purpose of determining where (a) the differences begin to "level off" or (b) a reversal in magnitude of difference occurs. The scree criterion suggested a five, eight or eleven factor solution for frequency with preference for the latter since an examination of the initial principal axis matrix revealed the presence of only one substantial factor loading associated with the remaining nine excluded factors--a loading of .374 on factor thirteen. To resolve the choice among these three solutions, five, eight and eleven factors were subsequently rotated with the result that the eleven factor solution lent itself to clearest interpretation. The decision, therefore, was to retain eleven factors for rotation.

To achieve greater precision, the log item correlation matrix was refactored using the sum of the squared factor loadings on the eleven retained factors as estimates of effective communalities. Refactored results are displayed in the righthand portion of Table 4.

Factors emanating from the refactored solution were then subjected to an oblique promax rotation (12) for the purpose of obtaining meaningful structure. Table 5 presents the specific problems that had a .300 or higher loading on each of the eleven frequency factors.

TABLE 5

ELEVEN FACTOR SOLUTION FOR FREQUENCY DATA FROM THE TEACHER PROBLEMS CHECKLIST: READING

(Astericks denote problems identified as significant for all respondents. N = 528)

Factor I: Invigoration

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
73*	Enhancing my students' interest in and attitudes toward reading.	.556
90*	Motivating students to read.	.502
19*	Getting students to enjoy it.	.482
102*	Overcoming students' indifference toward reading.	.465
87*	Getting students to read more.	.443
3	Changing the negative perceptions and attitudes of students toward reading--doing those things which seem likely to result in more positive perceptions and attitudes.	.419
94*	Overcoming students' feelings of frustration.	.356
78	Overcoming student apathy or outright dislike.	.333
15*	Because I want my students to have a better self-concept.	.325
36*	Having students feel successful at reading.	.322
106	Having students feel that they are making satisfactory progress.	.310

Factor II: Skill Building in Oral Reading

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
42	Improving students' oral reading ability.	.489
46*	Getting students to read accurately orally.	.447

4	Helping students feel secure and unafraid when reading aloud.	.445
77	Getting students to read loudly and clearly.	.438
61*	Getting students to read aloud with expression.	.430
5	Doing the things which seem likely to help students improve in oral reading.	.410

Factor III: Time

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
80*	Finding enough time to help all reading groups.	.581
66*	Teaching too many students or large classes.	.480
30*	Having enough time to work with students who need special help.	.459
59	Being unencumbered by other things such as taking attendance, collecting assignments and passing out materials when I should be teaching.	.417
57*	Having preparation time.	.398
81*	Completing the work I have planned.	.357

Factor IV: Support

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
71	Getting other teachers to encourage interest in and positive attitudes toward reading and to teach it better themselves.	.629
96	Because I want other teachers to stimulate interest in reading.	.619
43	Getting others to use standardized tests for diagnosis rather than using them to reinforce cultural stereotypes.	.575
86	Being able to find and/or use culture-fair tests.	.400
33	Because I want teachers in earlier grades to do a more effective job of teaching reading.	.349
76	Reinforcing cultural stereotypes to get federal or state money.	.316

Factor V: Professional Worth

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
10	Being recognized as a successful teacher of reading by having my students do well so that my colleagues are aware of my teaching effectiveness.	.545
14	Feeling successful as a teacher of reading--doing things and having colleagues and administrators do things which contribute to my success.	.495
6	Gaining the respect and esteem of my colleagues and others--doing those things which are honored, esteemed and respected.	.460
63	Getting my colleagues to consider my teaching effective.	.378
9	Organizing and preparing to teach reading so that I will be clear and alert.	.354
103	Because I want to feel successful as a teacher of reading.	.317

Factor VI: Individualization

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
56*	Having appropriate materials for different interest levels.	.606
21*	Knowing about and having available a full range of reading materials--doing those things which identify and procure such materials.	.597
92*	Knowing about and having appropriate materials for a wide range of students.	.574
1*	Having appropriate materials for different reading levels.	.497
22*	Finding materials of interest for each student.	.440
44	Having materials needed to help students improve word attack skills.	.383

Factor VII: Skill Building in Word Recognition

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
68	Getting students to recognize sight words.	.499
60	Getting students to do well on reading readiness exercises.	.475
27	Getting students to pronounce letters combined into blends, digraphs and diphthongs correctly.	.390
55	Teaching about syllables.	.388
89*	Helping students to overcome perceptual problems.	.380
41	Getting students to pronounce letters of the alphabet correctly.	.369
64*	Improving students' word attack skills.	.349
50	Getting students to read each word.	.335
46*	Getting students to read accurately orally.	.334
95	Getting students to perform well enough on standardized tests to satisfy others.	.333

Factor VIII: Competence in Diagnosis and Remediation

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
34	Knowing how to evaluate students' comprehension abilities.	.458
52*	Gaining skills in the diagnosis of individual student reading difficulties and having the time and opportunity to employ such skills.	.414
24*	Identifying students' reading difficulties.	.368
35*	Doing the things which seem likely to help students to improve in reading comprehension ability such as giving attention to meaning, retention, inference making, vocabulary development and syntax.	.323
9	Organizing and preparing to teach reading so that I will be clear and alert.	.322

58	Assessing student achievement.	.322
49*	Knowing each student and his or her reading problems.	.309

Factor IX: Skill Building in Reading Comprehension

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
17*	Getting students to learn and remember basic terms in a special subject area.	.435
28*	Getting students to comprehend.	.411
16*	Getting students to read at a rate appropriate for comprehending the material.	.371
40*	Getting students to see meaning in the printed page.	.367
38*	Getting students to do things such as working carefully or spelling correctly.	.330
29*	Having students make inferences from their reading.	.309
98*	Getting students to read for and recall details.	.300

Factor X: Security

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
25	Establishing and maintaining rapport with students.	.479
39	Knowing how to correct students who are easily embarrassed.	.376
105	Being more patient.	.358
99	Being organized.	.338
70	Being prepared.	.309

Factor XI: Student Success

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
84	Because I want students to learn faster.	.367
101*	Because I want students to be prepared.	.363
98*	Getting students to read for and recall details.	.329
100*	Getting students to retain and use what they have learned.	.314

Note - These results were used to construct the TPC-R, Form C

The factors were labeled and defined as below.

Factor I:	Invigoration	- Wanting to vitalize my students' interests in learning and improve their achievement.
Factor II:	Skill Building in Oral Reading	- Wanting students to improve in oral reading. Doing those things which seem likely to improve that ability in students.
Factor III:	Time	- Wanting time to get both professional and personal things accomplished.
Factor IV:	Support	- Wanting the understanding and sustenance of administrators and other teachers so that I can be efficient and feel professional.
Factor V:	Professional Worth	- Gaining the respect and esteem of my colleagues and others. Doing those things which are honored, esteemed and respected so as to gain that sense of worth.
Factor VI:	Individualization	- Wanting to know about and have available a full range of reading materials. Doing those things which identify and procure such materials.

Factor VII:	Skill Building in Word Recognition	- Wanting students to improve in word recognition skills. Doing those things which seem to improve those abilities in students.
Factor VIII:	Competence in Diagnosis and Remediation	- Wanting skills in the diagnosis and remediation of individual student reading difficulties.
Factor IX:	Skill Building in Reading Comprehension	- Wanting students to improve in reading comprehension. Doing those things which seem to improve that ability in students.
Factor X:	Security	- Wanting to feel free from fear and anxiety.
Factor XI:	Student Success	- Wanting to help students to succeed academically and personally. Wanting the student to be efficient and effective. Doing those things--invigorating, counseling, guiding, establishing optimal classroom learning conditions--as a teacher which will lead to these goals.

With respect to the bothersomeness responses, the factor analytic methodology was identical. Subsequent to obtaining the initial overfactored principal-axis matrix, a decision was made to refactor and rotate ten factors. Table 6 presents the results of the initial overfactoring and the subsequent refactoring.

TABLE 6

PRINCIPAL AXIS SOLUTION OF BOTHERSOMENESS RESPONSES USED TO DETERMINE THE NUMBER OF SALIENT FACTORS

	Squared Multiple Correlations Used as Estimates of Communalities			Sum of Squared Factor Loadings Subsequently Used as Estimates of Communalities	
Factor	Eigenvalue	Eigenvalue Difference	Percent Variance	Eigenvalue	Percent Variance
1	27.80	24.18	53.90	27.47	60.19
2	3.62	.56	60.92	3.58	68.04
3	3.06	.55	66.86	3.01	74.64
4	2.51	.45	71.73	2.46	80.03
5	2.06	.20	75.72	2.06	84.55
6	1.86	.34	79.33	1.81	88.52
7	1.52	.34	82.28	1.65	92.13
8	1.18	.14	84.58	1.13	94.62
9	1.04	.07	86.59	.98	96.77
10	.97	.00	88.47	.96	98.86
11	.97	.06	90.35		
12	.91	.12	92.11		
13	.79	.07	93.65		
14	.72	.06	95.04		
15	.71	.03	96.41		
16	.68	.06	97.73		
17	.62	.02	98.92		
18	.60	.05	100.09		
19	.55	.01	101.16		

(continued)

Factor	Eigenvalue	Eigenvalue Difference	Percent Variance	Eigenvalue	Percent Variance
20	.54		102.22*		

* When the factor matrix is initially overfactored and squared multiple correlations are used for communality estimation, it is common that latter factors account for more than 100 percent of common variance (trace).

Table 7 presents the specific problems that had a .300 or higher loading on each of the ten bothersomeness factors.

TABLE 7

TEN FACTOR SOLUTION FOR BOTHERSOMENESS DATA FROM THE TEACHER PROBLEMS CHECKLIST: READING

(Asterisks denote problems identified as significant for all respondents. N = 528)

Factor I: Invigoration

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
90*	Motivating students to read.	.470
102*	Overcoming students' indifference toward reading.	.449
87*	Getting students to read more.	.429
73*	Enhancing my students' interest in and attitudes toward reading.	.344
93*	Getting students to try harder.	.343
103	Because I want to feel successful as a teacher of reading.	.329
106*	Having students feel that they are making satisfactory progress.	.323
78*	Overcoming student apathy or outright dislike.	.317
94*	Overcoming students' feelings of frustration.	.301

Factor II: Skill Building in Oral Reading

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
42	Improving students' oral reading ability.	.530
46	Getting students to read accurately orally.	.525
61	Getting students to read aloud with expression.	.482
41	Getting students to pronounce letters of the alphabet correctly.	.388
77	Getting students to read loudly and clearly.	.348
54	Helping students learn to read fluently.	.345
67*	Helping students to comprehend what they are reading orally.	.332
50	Getting students to read each word.	.319

Factor III: Support

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
71	Getting other teachers to encourage interest in and positive attitudes toward reading and to teach it better themselves.	.575
43	Getting others to use standardized tests for diagnosis rather than using them to reinforce cultural stereotypes.	.547
96	Because I want other teachers to stimulate interests in reading.	.532
86	Being able to find and/or use cultural-fair tests.	.477
76	Reinforcing cultural stereotypes to get federal or state money.	.394

Factor IV: Time

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
80*	Finding enough time to help all reading groups.	.444
81	Completing the work I have planned.	.433
66*	Teaching too many students or large classes.	.431
59	Being unencumbered by other things such as taking attendance, collecting assignments and passing out materials when I should be teaching.	.386
57*	Having preparation time.	.342
104	Getting students to achieve up to standards set by publishers of reading materials.	.322

Factor V: Individualization

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
21*	Knowing about and having available a full range of reading materials--doing those things which identify and procure such materials.	.638
92*	Knowing about and having appropriate materials for a wide range of students.	.530
56*	Having appropriate materials for different interest levels.	.527
1*	Having appropriate materials for different reading levels.	.502
44	Having materials needed to help students improve word attack skills.	.433
22*	Finding materials of interest for each student.	.412

Factor VI: Security

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
25	Establishing and maintaining rapport with students.	.450
70	Being prepared.	.422
99	Being organized.	.414
31	Being awake and alert.	.380
39	Knowing how to correct students who are easily embarrassed.	.359

Factor VII: Competence in Diagnosis and Remediation

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
52*	Gaining skill in the diagnosis of individual student reading difficulties and having the time and opportunity to employ such skills.	.461
64*	Improving students' word attack skills.	.407
30*	Having enough time to work with students who need special help.	.395

Factor VIII: Nurturance

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
12	Getting students to wear their glasses.	.379
4	Helping students feel secure and unafraid when reading aloud.	.363
53	Getting parents to provide glasses for students with visual problems.	.331

Factor IX: Professional Worth

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
10	Being recognized as a successful teacher of reading by having my students do well so that my colleagues are aware of my teaching effectiveness.	.559
6	Gaining the respect and esteem of my colleagues and others--doing those things which are honored, esteemed and respected.	.541
63	Getting my colleagues to consider my teaching effective.	.469
14	Feeling successful as a teacher of reading--doing things and having colleagues and administrators do things which contribute to my success.	.317

Factor X: Skill Building in Reading Comprehension

TPC-R #	Problem Statement	Factor Loading
17	Getting students to learn and remember basic terms in a special subject area.	.390
16	Getting students to read at a rate appropriate for comprehending the material.	.373
28*	Getting students to comprehend.	.322

Note - These results were used to construct the TPC-R, Form C

The factors were labeled and defined as below.

Factor I: Invigoration - Wanting to vitalize my students' interests in learning and improve their achievement.

Factor II: Skill Building in Oral Reading - Wanting students to improve in oral reading. Doing those things which seem likely to improve that ability in students.

Factor III:	Support	- Wanting the understanding and sustenance of administrators and other teachers so that I can be efficient and feel professional.
Factor IV:	Time	- Wanting time to get both professional and personal things accomplished.
Factor V:	Individualization	- Wanting to know about and have available a full range of reading materials. Doing those things which identify and procure such materials.
Factor VI:	Security	- Wanting to feel free from fear and anxiety.
Factor VII:	Competence in Diagnosis and Remediation	- Wanting skills in the diagnosis and remediation of individual student reading difficulties.
Factor VIII:	Nurturance	- Wanting to help students who have problems.
Factor IX:	Professional Worth	- Gaining the respect and esteem of my colleagues and others. Doing those things which are honored, esteemed and respected so as to gain that sense of worth.
Factor X:	Skill Building in Reading Comprehension	- Wanting students to improve in reading comprehension. Doing those things which seem to improve that ability in students.

Responses from two scales, one indicating the extent to which teachers of reading perceived a problem as occurring frequently within their classrooms and the other scale indicating the extent to which they perceived a problem as bothersome, were subjected to factor analysis. Eleven factors emerged from this analysis of the frequency scale and ten emerged from the bothersome scale. These factors provided a relatively clear view of not just teacher perceptions of problems associated with teaching reading, but, indeed, provided an interesting and occasionally provocative glimpse of their assumptions and convictions

about teaching, the reading process, learning, and curriculum. Several factors revealed a deep sense of frustration and a yearning to improve and grow professionally. Other factors reflected an unusually narrow and alarmingly sterile conception of curriculum. And some factors made painfully obvious perceptions based upon ignorance, misinformation, and warrantless assumptions. Each factor is discussed below incorporating the perspective of the bothersome scale. Since an oblique rotation was employed, relationships among factors will be discussed where logically warranted.

DISCUSSION

Invigoration

Underlying the desire to stir and invigorate student interest in reading is the elemental notion that reading ability grows, in part, in proportion to the amount one reads. Teachers understand both that reading is fundamental to achievement in school, given our enormous reliance on textbooks as the primary source of new learnings in American schools, and that single textbooks appear a mainstay of the curriculum from middle school through graduate school. Knowing that so much of a student's potential and future achievements are based upon success in learning to read and learning from reading, teachers believe that motivation and invigoration of reading are keys to unlocking the doors to student power and skill in reading. Of course, underlying this belief are the twin assumptions that the textbook is an effective medium of instruction and that both reading ability and motivation, where they are lacking, must be inflated to a level sufficient to comprehend the textbook.

The problem with this assumption, however, is that no student, no matter how well he reads, can comprehend materials which assume concepts and experiences not in his possession. Since no textbook can match the experiential and conceptual backgrounds of all the pupils in class, problems are certain to arise if, rather than use varied materials, teachers employ single textbooks. The problem statements making up this factor dramatically demonstrate, however, that rather than utilize a variety of books selected to appeal to student interests and tailored to their experiences and abilities, teachers believe they must "stretch" students to fit books. Problem statements such as "Getting students to enjoy it," "Overcoming indifference," "Overcoming student's feelings of frustration," "Changing negative perceptions and attitudes toward reading," "Overcoming apathy and outright dislike," and "Having students feel successful at reading" load on the invigoration factor both for frequency and for bothersomeness. All of these statements express the desire to change students in the direction of the materials of instruction. The expensive and enormous magnitude of any effort to accomplish this change in reading abilities certainly has not been given very serious attention if these data mean anything.

Motivation is inextricably linked to interests, preferences, and, above all, reading ability. Textbooks by design introduce in rapid order many new concepts and notions partly or wholly unknown to learners. Unless readers comprehend much if not most of a selection before they ever read it, they will learn little from it (2). Without sufficient prior levels of understanding for any given textbook, the reading task will be extraordinarily difficult producing in students feelings of frustration, dislike, apathy, indifference, and failure. Given this state of affairs, teachers are likely to feel that invigoration and student motivation, indeed, are serious problems. A more

realistic and effective solution to the problem would be to abandon single textbook instruction and adopt the practice of teaching from a range of materials suited to varied student backgrounds and reading abilities.

Skill Building in Oral Reading

Oral reading appears to be a pervasive activity both in the teaching of reading and in the teaching of subject matter. The functions of oral reading in both are to monitor student progress and skill, to achieve specific learning goals such as highlighting important ideas or providing practice at locating them, and to a more limited extent, to provide a means of sharing content to broaden interpretation as well as provide an avenue of learning for pupils who read poorly and for whom other means of learning cannot be or are not made available.

Inherent in these functions is the assumption that reading, unlike speech, should be or must be free of error, false starts, hesitations, and faulty prediction. Indeed, the assumption is that instant reading must approximate rehearsed, dramatically interpreted speech. Implied also in this factor is the notion that, unlike many professional performers, students can learn to function securely and fearlessly in performances before audiences of their peers over content purposely designed to be new to them and written with little or no thought of or feel for speech. Unrehearsed reading, even by skilled performers who read lines for a living, has most of the characteristics of unrehearsed spoken language-garbles, fillers, hesitations, repetitions, mispronunciations, substitutions, insertions, and the like. Adequate preparation and rehearsal would eliminate these common oral language characteristics

for most average readers. Poor readers should never be required to read before a live audience without prior substantive preparation. Where oral reading is used to achieve particular curricular or learning objectives, the pedagogical literature indicates these purposes should be clearly and carefully delimited in scope and duration.

Naturalistic studies of reading (11, 14) demonstrate that oral reading is never error free. In the main this teacher problem appears to arise out of unreasonable, unwarranted assumptions. Oral reading, when its function is to provide feedback to the teacher, should contain miscues, as Goodman (11) refers to them, if the teacher is to gain insight into the reading strategies, strengths, thinking patterns, and weaknesses of a pupil. In this case difficult materials are purposely selected for oral reading. Again, the problems indicated in this factor stem from unreasonable, unwarranted expectations.

Getting students to read with accuracy and with expression were significant concerns for all respondents. This dimension of the factor, that is, that all respondents shared this concern suggests how widespread the practice of having students read aloud has become and how poorly most teachers understand this aspect of reading and language as dynamic processes.

Time

Many if not most of the assumptions inherent in how teachers and administrators view instruction as well as how they understand reading and language as processes are reflected in this factor. Both intermediate and secondary school instruction are heavily and often exclusively dependent on textbooks as a primary medium of instruction which in part, explains why teachers and administrators perceive classes as too large to achieve the teacher's instruc-

tional objectives. Given the prevailing dependence on textbooks, a high probability exists that pupil achievements will be distributed similar to the way reading ability is distributed in a class. The relationship between reading ability and single text instruction, over and above any classroom management and grouping difficulties associated with time available for instruction, explains this perception. Strikingly, single textbook methodology was perceived a problem by every respondent. Reading and learning from reading in a wide variety of materials pervade nearly every response in the factor identified as individualization. The feeling that there is never enough time for reading instruction, when, in fact, most curriculum activities in a wide spectrum of content areas incorporate reading or preparation for reading, suggests both the strength of this perception and the extent to which it is related to other factors.

In all probability several other factors which emerged from the data exacerbate the feeling that not enough time is available for reading instruction. Factors describing feelings of support, professional worth and competence, the desire to improve basic reading abilities, the problems associated with individualizing instruction, the wish to be instrumental in each pupil's reading successes undoubtedly contributed to the strong time pressure mirrored by this factor. The extent to which time pressure is seen as a problem by educators, both in frequency and in bothersomeness, is indicated by the very high proportion of items in the factor structure identified as significant by all respondents. Five out of six statements in the factor structure for frequency meet this criterion while three out of six did likewise for bothersomeness. Teachers felt there simply was not enough time available for reading instruction.

As a practical matter, gaining more instructional time can be achieved

through increasing the amount of time available for reading instruction at the expense of other curriculum areas or through lowering pupil-teacher ratios. In addition, some efficiencies can be gained through improved organization and planning such as reducing class size in the primary grades by starting the school day earlier and adopting split sessions. Not all of these remedies work. Balow's (1) results suggest that smaller pupil-teacher ratios at the primary level will indeed bring about greater gains in reading achievement; however, no such relationship between class size and achievement has been demonstrated at other grade levels and in other curriculum areas (9, 13). In other words, smaller classes cannot remedy the effects of single textbook instruction. Amount of instructional exposure as measured by pupil attendance and length of school day also affect achievement positively (15). Attendance at school can be very beneficial but layering on more and more formal reading instruction does not appear to be a good way to use the pupil's time once he is there. How pupils spend time is the essential question. "Time belongs to the learner." How teachers spend time must be considered in this perspective.

The teacher's sense that time is important is convincingly validated by the literature. Their problem statements regarding instructional time suggest a uniform and widely held perspective, but one which does not discern how important pupil time is or what the relationship between teacher and pupil utilization of time implies.

Support

None of the problem statements defining the factor "support" for either bothersomeness or frequency--achieved significance. Nor were these statements strongly or widely held by any of the subgroups. Some respondents appeared to

feel that colleagues and administrators do not encourage and support their efforts to improve pupil reading ability. Three of the items which contributed to this factor reflected a desire to eliminate or at least deflate cultural stereotypes held by colleagues. Since not a single item in this factor was identified as significant by respondents, this concern for stereotyping may be an artifact which reflects an unidentified but distinct subgroup within the overall group. Individual problem factor loadings, as contrasted with their respective rankings or with their significance, are among the strongest obtained suggesting a high degree of cohesion among those who perceived "support" as a problem.

Professional Worth

The factor structure for professional worth has many of the same characteristics as the structure for support. The perceptions reflected in this factor were not widely held nor were they uniformly held. Underlying the need for respect and esteem suggested by this factor may be an ideal of success in teaching as measured by the teacher's ability to bring about significant achievement in reading. Or as noted above, a distinct subgroup may share this conception of the importance of reading achievement. These data are not sufficiently defined to allow more than this very tentative interpretation.

Individualization

Individualization was one of the most interesting factors to emerge from these data. Loadings were very high, and for both bothersomeness and frequency, all of the statements comprising the factor structure except one achieved significance. The various subgroups differed little in their rankings

for each statement. But most interesting of all is the fact that each statement focused on selecting reading materials. Individualization was defined solely as a process of manipulating materials. And what is more, not one group felt that appropriate reading materials were available for a wide range of distinct pupil interests and abilities.

Knowing full well that reading materials play a critical role in the teacher's ability to meet pupil needs and confronted by the stark fact of their unavailability, each group appeared to apprehend the full significance of this problem. Essentially, their task was to make bricks without straw. Recognizing the clear futility their position, their concerns for motivation, skill building, and time were fully understandable. Given, too, this rather constrained view of individualization, even though it may not be fully acceptable, their desire for support and their concerns for professional worth can be appreciated.

Skill Building in Word Recognition

While word recognition instruction was seen as a "frequent" but not a "bothersome" problem, it appeared only to be a problem in the sense of requiring on-going attention by teachers and specialists whose level of instruction and primary instructional responsibility demanded a focus on developing word study skills. Running through most of the individual problems was the implication that traditional word recognition skills are not easily learned--an observation most likely shared by elementary teachers and reading specialists because of their instructional level. As seen in Table 3, of the three items deemed significant in this particular factor, two appeared in the top third of the rankings and by only three of the five groups. Elementary,

middle school, and special reading teachers ranked the statement, "Improving student's word attack skills," 36, 34, and 31 respectively. For the statement, "Helping students to overcome perceptual problems," supervisory-administrative personnel replaced middle school teachers in this trio and, surprisingly, ranked this problem 16th. Undoubtedly students with perceptual problems received a good deal of attention and because of the sometimes unusual character of their problems, and it must be added, often unwarranted interpretation of them, administrators may be inclined to overreact to these cases.

Perhaps the greatest significance of this factor is the implied but incorrect assumption that word recognition is the product of intensive, concerted, formal instruction rather than a product of learning to integrate graphic information with already existing language capabilities. According to Gibson and Levin (10):

> "We have not yet achieved an adequate understanding of what it is that can be generalized in orthography; the other that, whatever it is, the child learns it on his own, and not by way of a set of planned exercises."

Early reading appears to take the following course: (a) Substitute words that fit the sense of the sentence; (b) Look over the letters in the word and keep silent if you cannot make sense of it; (c) If it helps, try out a word using whatever letter information can be gleaned but base the response on its sensibleness in the sentence (10). What teachers need to learn is that telling children rules and trying to get them to attend to the formal properties of intraword structure is like telling someone to listen to a story so as to understand it by virtue of its syntactic constituents rather than its meanings. Children must discover useful word structure tacitly, over time, through meaningful reading, and with sensitive guidance from the teacher when pupils require it.

Competence in Diagnosis and Remediation

Problems associated with diagnosing and remediating reading difficulties were among the most bothersome of those identified in this study. Problems of evaluation and subsequent instruction directed toward individual student difficulties appeared grounded more in having the time and opportunity to work with students than in feelings of not knowing how to deal with student reading difficulties. On the "frequency" scale problem statements reflected an understanding that appraisal is an important, on-going teaching responsibility, a perception sure to have heightened feelings of urgency about knowing how to evaluate reading ability. The relative strength of the "bothersome" dimension on this factor can be appreciated by noting that two of the three statements comprising this factor were ranked in the top ten by all subgroups with one exception--secondary teachers viewed gaining skill in diagnosis as less important than other groups did. One problem statement, "Having enough time to work with students who need special help," was ranked first in bothersomeness by all groups except reading specialists who ranked the statement second. Without question, concern for competence in diagnosis and remediation of reading difficulties was widely held and strongly felt by those directly and indirectly responsible for reading instruction.

Skill Building in Reading Comprehension

All of the statements which loaded on this "comprehension" factor for the frequency scale were from among the 57 problems identified as significant for all respondents. Not only were problems associated with developing comprehension viewed as frequent; many were ranked among the most bothersome in the sample by all subgroups. Most problem statements presupposed meaning to be

logically a product of direct apprehension rather than a construct requiring a cognitive contribution from the reader. Statements such as "Getting students to see meaning in the printed page," and "Getting students to do things such as working carefully..." ranked among the top ten problems on the bothersome scale--reflecting a view that the structure of a reader's knowledge neither affects nor impinges upon the material to be comprehended. On the contrary, to apprehend the meanings intended by a writer, a reader must relate these meanings to the larger context of his own organized system of knowledge and frequently must reorganize that system to accomodate new information.

Significantly missing from the problem statements were acknowledgements that factors inherent in written materials can affect comprehension. However, statements such as those dealing with getting students to read at an appropriate rate, and getting them to infer reflected an awareness that learning from reading is significantly affected by tactics employed by the reader.

Security

All subgroups within this sample appeared to be concerned about maintaining a secure and well-managed learning environment for reading instruction. Neither on the bothersome scale nor on the frequency scale did any of the problem statements achieve significance. In general this factor reflects a healthy concern for the personal worth of students and the professional responsibilities of a competent teacher.

Student Success

While this factor emerged only on the frequency scale indicating a recurring problem, half of the statements which comprise this factor were ranked

among the top ten by middle and high school teachers on the bothersome scale. These statements suggest that teachers in these two groups particularly but in the other groups as well perceive learning from reading to be a significant hurdle for students. Because preparing students to learn things from books is an important, on-going teaching activity, these concerns are obviously well-founded. On the other hand, reading for sheer enjoyment may be equally if not more important, for language, even printed language, has more than just an informational function. Language also serves deeply personal and subjective ends. Language is an abiding source of deep esthetic meaning. Not reading is as crippling a handicap as not being able to read.

CONCLUSIONS

Many of the problems of teachers identified in this study have their origins in misconceptions about the nature and functions of reading. Reading to learn is an essential activity which is dependent upon numerous perceptual, cognitive, and motivational factors. But most of all reading is an instance of language--whose nature and functions must be understood if reading is ever to become an effective means of learning. Unfortunately, the majority of problems identified in this study revealed that many teachers have only a modest understanding of language and the reading process. If these problems are to be resolved, both preservice and inservice teacher education will need to include significantly greater and more effective instruction in language.

What is known about learning to read has been expanded dramatically over the past decade. These problem statements were deeply steeped in the analogies and terminology of another generation. They suggest that, still, teachers search to find that one omniscient method that will end all reading problems.

Practicing teachers desperately need theoretical guides for observing children and for curricular planning. Quite plainly, their knowledge base needs to be upgraded and updated.

Reading is an active language process useful in achieving a variety of purposes and instantly available at all times. But reading cannot serve alone as the summation of all curriculum efforts. To learn from reading requires a substantial knowledge background. By and large these problem statements set forth the view that reading ability alone required expansion and enrichment but that curriculum could suffice as those experiences to be found in textbooks. The proper role and function of reading in curriculum must be impressed upon both new and experienced teachers.

Other problems reflected very real shortcomings in the availability of time and teaching materials. These shortcomings, in turn, appeared to have a debilitating effect on teacher morale and their sense of professional competence and worth. The solution to these problems will more than likely be found in sound, sustaining, school leadership and administration. Repeatedly, these problem statements proclaimed teachers' desires to be competent and effective in teaching reading.

REFERENCES

1. Balow, I. H. "A Longitudinal Evaluation of Reading Achievement in Small Classes," Elementary English. Vol. 46 (February 1969) 184-187.

2. Bormuth, J. R. "Literacy in the Classroom," Help for the Reading Teacher: New Directions in Research. Ed. William D. Page. Urbana, Ill.: National Conference on Research in English, 1975.

3. Cottell, R. B. "The Meaning and Strategic Use of Factor Analysis," Handbook of Multivariate Experimental Psychology. Ed. R. B. Cattell. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, (1966) 174-243.

4. Cruickshank, Donald R. and James Leonard. The Identification and Analysis of Perceived Problems of Teachers in Inner-City Schools. The NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, Occasional Paper/One. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967.

5. Cruickshank, Donald R. and Betty Myers. A Brief Review of Studies of Problems of Teachers Conducted by Donald R. Cruickshank with Others with Particular Attention to Instrument Development. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, College of Education, September, 1975.

6. Cruickshank, Donald R., John J. Kennedy and Betty Myers. "Perceived Problems of Secondary School Teachers," Journal of Educational Research. Vol. 68 (December 1974) 155-159.

7. Cruickshank, Donald R., John J. Kennedy, James Leonard and Robert Thurman. Perceived Problems of Teachers in Schools Serving Rural Disadvantaged Populations: A Comparison With Problems Reported by Inner-City Teachers. The NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth, Occasional Paper-Five. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1968.

8. Cureton, E. E. A Factor Analysis of Project Talent Tests and Four Other Test Batteries. Interim Report 4 to the U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 3051, Project Talent, Palo Alto, CA, 1968.

9. Gajewsky, S. Class Size: A Review of the Literature and Selected Annotated Bibliography. Reports in Education No. 2. A Monograph. Montreal: McGill University, 1973.

10. Gibson, E. J. and H. Levin. The Psychology of Reading. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press, 1975.

11. Goodman, K. "Analysis of Oral Reading Miscues: Applied Psycholinguistics," Reading Research Quarterly. Vol. 5 (Fall 1969) 9-30.

12. Hendrickson, A. E. and P. O. White. "Promax: A Quick Method for Relation to Oblique Simple Structure," British Journal of Statistical Psychology. Vol. 17 (May 1964) 65-70.

13. Shapson, S. N. Optimum Class Size? A Review of the Literature. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education Research Department, 1972.

14. Weber, Rose Marie. "First-Graders' Use of Grammatical Context in Reading," Basic Studies on Reading. Eds. H. Levin and J. Williams. New York: Basic Books, Inc. (1970) 147-163.

15. Wiley, D. E. and A. Harnischfeger. "Explosion of a Myth: Quantity of Schooling and Exposure to Instruction, Major Educational Vehicles," Educational Researcher. Vol. 3 (April 1974) 7-12.

ABSTRACT

Responses from 528 educators to a Teacher Problems Checklist for Reading incorporating both a "frequency" and a "bothersome" scale were factor-analyzed and subjected to an oblique, promax rotation. Eleven factors emerged from the "frequency" scale and ten factors emerged from the "bothersome" scale. Factors such as invigoration, professional worth, and skill-building in reading comprehension provided a rather clear indication of those problems seen by educators as either difficult to resolve or occurring with noticeable frequency. The factors which emerged from this analysis also revealed interesting and occasionally provocative assumptions and convictions about teaching, the reading process, learning, and curriculum. Others portrayed a deep sense of frustration on the part of teachers and a yearning to improve and grow professionally.